

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 19 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-06)
Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

| Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 199 | no persons are required to respond to a coll | ellection of information unless it displays a valid OM9 control number |
|---|---|--|
| | Application Number | 09/835,663 |
| TRANSMITTAL | Filing Date | April 16, 2001 |
| FORM | First Named Inventor | Wein |
| | Art Unit | 2152 |
| (to be used for all correspondence after initia. | Examiner Name | Chang, Julian |
| | 3 Attorney Docket Number | 15 |
| Total Number of Pages in This Submission | 3 | |
| | ENCLOSURES (Check all | that apply) |
| Fee Transmittal Form | Drawing(s) | After Allowance Communication to TO Appeal Communication to Board |
| Fee Attached | Licensing-related Papers | of Appeals and Interferences |
| Amendment/Reply After Final | Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application | Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Repty Brief) Proprietary Information |
| Affidavits/declaration(s) | Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence A | on |
| Extension of Time Request | Terminal Disclaimer | Other Enclosure(s) (please Idenfity below): |
| Express Abandonment Request | Request for Refund | Communication Regarding Examiner Interview |
| Information Disclosure Statement | CD, Number of CD(s) | |
| | Landscape Table on CD | , |
| Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) | Remarks | |
| Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts | i i | |
| under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | 17 | Carrier Co. |
| | | |
| SIGNA | TURE OF APPLICANT, ATTOR | RNEY, OR AGENT |
| irm Name Law Office of David H. Αμ | idson | |
| Signature | | |
| Printed name David H. Judson | | |
| October 19, 2006 | R | Reg. No. 30,467 |
| | | |
| С | ERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSI | ION/MAILING |
| | | |
| hereby certify that this correspondence is tufficient postage as first class mail in an eli | peing facsimile transmitted to the USPTC evelope addressed to: Commissioner for | O or deposited with the United States Postal Service with r Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on |
| hereby certify that this correspondence is b | peing facsimile transmitted to the USPTC ivelope addressed to: Commissioner for 1 - 571 - 273 - 8 | r Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on |

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

p.2

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

#15

OCT 1 9 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Wein et al.

Serial Number:

09/835,663

Filing Date:

April 16, 2001

Art Unit:

2152

Examiner:

Chang, Julian

For:

Content Delivery Network (CDN)
Content Server Request Mechanism
With Metadata Framework Support

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMUNICATION REGARDING EXAMINER INTERVIEW

The Interview Summary that accompanied the office action mailed September 19, 2006 included the statement that "[a]greement was reached that the amendments filed in the RCE on 08/01/06 overcame the combined reference of Gupta-Shobatake." The undersigned appreciates the statement that "[a]greement was reached" (which it was) but the nature of the agreement (from the undersigned's perspective) was that the combined reference of Gupta-Shobatake was simply misapplied — irrespective of the amendments that were included in the RCE. This point was made in the RCE submission itself ("[t]]hese amendments are not dictated by the prior art"), as well as by the arguments presented during the Interview. The undersigned does not believe there was an agreement or understanding to the effect that it was the particular amendments filed in the RCE — as opposed to the defects in the references themselves — that undermined the then-pending rejection.

These comments are provided simply to avoid any presumption that the RCE amendments were dictated by the Gupta-Shobatake prior art, which they were not.

#15

PATENT

The remainder of the Interview Summary accurately reflects the nature of the exhibit that was shown, the claims that were discussed, the specific prior art that was discussed, and the other pertinent matters that were discussed. Once again, the Examiner wishes to thank Examiner Chang for the courtesies extended during the Interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

David H. Judson, Reg. No. 30,467

15950 Dallas Parkway Suite 225 Dallas, Texas 75248 (972) 385-2018